



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*diaboles* which have no other basis than that of selfish temporary political expediency. A friendship for one nation which is simply the expression of hatred and fear of another is not friendship at all, it is hypocrisy and pretence.

Twenty-five years hence, if things go on as they are now going, all the present friendships and alliances of Europe will possibly have gone to pieces and new ones have appeared; England and Germany saying the pleasantest things imaginable of each other, France and Russia hating each other all the more bitterly because of their present unnatural fondness, Italy and Austria rushing madly at each other's throats over the mountains, and so on of the rest. What is real in the situation, on all sides, is the enmity, suspicion and fear. On these one can reckon. From these one can prophecy with something of certainty. Until these are measurably undermined, it makes little difference which nations are rushing with wild delight into each other's arms, or standing apart in sullen, growling mood. In the spirit now so largely actuating and dominating European politics, any one of the nations has sufficient influence to create a general row at any time. Turkey will continue to play the harlot by the roadside, flirting now with England, now with Germany, and the good Lord only knows with whom next. The political storm centre may be expected to change from year to year, but it is certain to be in evidence somewhere — in Alsace, in Egypt, on the Congo, in South Africa, at Constantinople, in Northern India, at Vladivostock or elsewhere. But where can any one locate a real peace centre? There is none, there never can be any, until this old inhuman spirit is undermined and destroyed. The London correspondent of the *New York Tribune* is right when he says that "European peace based upon the balance of power created by two essentially hostile alliances is an artificial, diplomatic fancy." He would have gone deeper into the truth if he had said alliances whose sole bond of union is dislike of some out-side nation.

It is humiliating in the extreme to see two great peoples, like the German and the English, either possessing sufficient inherent strength to lead the world to the recognition and adoption of the noblest ideals, acting towards each other in a way that would hardly be excusable in schoolboys angry on the field of sport. Perhaps we ought to say newspapers instead of peoples, though a short stay in either country convinces one that multitudes of the people would talk as the editors do, if they were in the editorial chairs. Ever since the famous message of Emperor William to President Krüger, things have gone from bad to worse. The English people went mad over this despatch, and their bad humor has not subsided.

English journals, even of the best type, indulge in continual taunts and jeers at the Emperor, expressing them-

selves in such language as, "I and the Almighty," "A Garrulous Potentate." These utterances are naturally resented. Why could not the English press have maintained a dignified silence over the Emperor's impetuous telegram? The German war department lets loose some carrier pigeons at Dover, and forthwith the English papers grow excited and want the war minister to put a stop to the intrusion, or have on hand plenty of hawks to eat up the German pigeons, as some of them were eaten at Dover. Thereupon the German papers grow very mocking, and so the bad spirit goes on, descending to trifles in order to find fault. But the serious thing about it all is that a strain is created everywhere in the larger relations of the two nations which makes real coöperation between them for any important end, like that of the settlement of the Græco-Turkish question, nearly impossible. Many sober minds on both sides of the Channel feel deeply pained at these sorry exhibitions of national insolence, vanity and spite, and are doing what they can to create a spirit of genuine sympathy and friendship, founded, not on political expediency, but on the everlasting principles of right, justice and love. Only when this is done can the present unfortunate strain be permanently removed, and a real abiding cordiality and coöperation for securing the great ends of humanity be secured. The note in the London Peace Society's address is the right one. It has also been sounded by the society recently organized for the specific purpose of bringing about more friendly relations between the two countries. The work which these organizations have undertaken in a small way is worthy of the most earnest and untiring efforts of all the friends of peace in both countries. The road may seem a long and unpromising one, but it is the only one which will ever lead to permanent friendship and abiding peace.

#### OUR SCHOOL HISTORIES AND ANGLOPHOBIA.

The matter of the influence of our school histories in inculcating in American children dislike of England is claiming wider and wider attention. Goldwin Smith, in a short and well-considered article in the September number of the *North American Review*, states it as his opinion, after careful examination, "that the influence of the American books in stimulating international illwill has been overstated." The closing paragraph of the article comes near to stating the real difficulty with most of the history text-books placed in the hands of our school children:

"The special fault which, if I may venture to say it, I should be inclined to find with these books is want of literary art. The writers may have thought that literary art would be wasted upon histories for children. At all events they have not bestowed it. The language is generally flat, and the story is not well told. It is partly,

perhaps, by lack of descriptive power that the writers are driven to give so much space to war. If they were artists they might find a way of lending interest to the events in the achievements of peace. To tell a story well, so that it may impress the imagination and fix itself in the memory of the reader, the writer must have distinctly conceived it as a whole in his own mind. This is what masters of narrative have evidently done. Freshness, simplicity and vividness of language, without turgidity or grandiloquence, are also indispensable in a narrative intended for the young. If any American would compose a school history combining these literary qualities with truthfulness, impartiality and freedom from low passions, he might render no small service to the nation."

The want of literary art in most of our history text-books, of which Dr. Smith mildly but justly complains, arises from the fact that their authors are wanting in historic perspective. They have treated United States history as if it were something apart, having no roots in the past and no connection with that of the rest of the world. The men who have prepared these books have not been usually real historians, who have made historic investigation a life business, and thus qualified themselves to give our history a right setting. Many of them have been hard-working teachers, who have hastily written, or rather compiled, their books in the spare moments left them after the accomplishment of their daily tasks. A number of them have prepared their works to "sell," possibly at the request of some enterprising publisher. In this way many school histories which ought never to have been written at all have gotten into the hands of the children in the schools. Possibly because of the newness of the country this has been the best that could have been done in the past, but the time has certainly come when our history should be written from a different point of view, and written by men who have made themselves capable of seeing the wider relations of their own country to the rest of the world. Without this wider view, it will be of little avail to leave out the wars. We should thus get tamer books than we have already had, and not real histories of the life and progress of the people.

The trouble with the history instruction in the schools has, however, been more with the teachers than with the books. At any rate, the writers of the text-books have not been more anglophobic than the users of them. Dr. Smith's estimate of these text-books is probably a correct one, and any good teacher, possessed of a well-instructed and fair spirit, can take a class of boys and girls through any one of them without inflaming them against Great Britain. The reformation in history work must be made, not in the text-books alone, but in the teachers, in the parents and among the people generally, especially among prominent people who *talk* history and often in such a way as to do irreparable mischief to young minds in their audiences. The living voice of a prominent public man, uttering fervidly from the platform anti-British or Ameri-

ica-for-Americans patriotism can do more mischief in five minutes than all the histories a boy will ever read. Let the reform begin with *persons* and the books will get right in time.

Two things will soon change the tone of our history text-books, so far as it needs changing, for these text-books are after all only one of the many forms in which the national spirit expresses itself. It is a satisfaction, be it said in passing, to know that a large-minded and impartial scholar like Goldwin Smith does not find the spirit of our people, as represented by our school histories, so English-hating as some Englishmen and almost as many Americans have declared it to be. The two influences to which we refer as certain to improve the tone of these histories are the growing demand among nearly all thoughtful Americans that we should have history text-books more completely in harmony with the true spirit of our American institutions, and, secondly, the rapid, world-wide movements of our time, which are compelling us to live more to the rest of the world and less exclusively to ourselves. The one of these influences will civilize us from within and the other from without, and our history text-books will yield to the pressure and hereafter show less childish delight in the wars in which we have whipped England in the past, and a more sober regard for the great contributions which the mother country along with our own has made to civil and religious progress.

We cannot refrain from saying, in this connection, that it is very unfortunate that such men as Chauncey M. Depew and Goldwin Smith should mix in with their discussion of a subject like this a prophecy that there will be a war sometime between Great Britain and this country. This is almost descending to the level of some of the school histories; it is dramatic and newspaperish; the mischief of it is that the utterance of such a thought by such men tends to bring about the very war which they are both so anxious to prevent. Mr. Depew thinks the school histories will produce the war; Professor Smith thinks them hardly equal to this task. He prophesies the war to be on the score of England's persisting in maintaining herself as a political and military power on this continent. But neither the one nor the other, nor both combined, will ever cause a war between the two countries. *There will be no future war between England and the United States.* These men ought to know that the causes of irritation between them are fewer to-day than ever before; that their people and their governments are wiser, patienter and more peaceful than in the past; that their common-binding interests are greater and continually growing; that the Anglo-Saxon conscience is more intelligently and resolutely opposed to war than it has been. Let every influential Englishman, Canadian and American begin to *believe*, as there is strong reason for believing, and to *say* that there will never be another Anglo-Ameri-

can war, and the incessant public utterance of this great thought will go far to make the prophecy self-realizing. Under the tremendous force of such an inspiring utterance the battle with the school histories will be a short and decisive one.

---

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

---

The sixth annual report of the International Peace Bureau at Berne has just reached us. The report covers sixteen pages and contains a résumé of the work of the Bureau during the year. It was presented at the annual meeting of the Society of the Bureau at Hamburg on the 12th of August. The Bureau has now been in operation for six years and under the admirable management of its Secretary, Mr. Ducommun, has become to the peace societies and the peace congress an indispensable agency for the effective prosecution of their work. It is financially dependent on the contributions of the societies and of individuals. The members of the Commission of the Bureau as elected at Hamburg, are Fredrik Bajer, Denmark; A. Gobat, Elie Ducommun and W. Marcusen, Switzerland; the Baroness von Suttner, Austria; Hodgson Pratt and Miss Ellen Robinson, England; Frederic Passy and Emile Arnaud, France; H. LaFontaine, Belgium; Adolf Richter and Count Bothmer, Germany; E. T. Moneta, Italy; Magalhães Lima, Portugal; Edward Wavrinisky, Sweden; Dr. Horst, Norway; Nicolas Fleva, Roumania; Belva A. Lockwood and Benjamin F. Trueblood, United States.

---

The Institute of International Law held its annual meeting at Copenhagen the 26th of August and following days. It was presided over by Senator Goos. Addresses of welcome were made by the Minister of Public Instruction on behalf of the King and the Government, by the President of the Senate, and the Chairman of the Committee of Reception. In all these addresses the work of the Institute in preparing the way for a better understanding between nations was highly spoken of.

---

Mr. Alfred H. Fried, editor of the *Friedens-Correspondenz*, Berlin, sent a résumé of the deliberations of the Hamburg Peace Congress to fifty-six papers in different parts of Germany. The review *Ethische Kultur* devoted its issue of the 14th of August almost entirely to the peace movement, giving among other things an account of the Peace Congress at Hamburg prepared by Professor Förster of Berlin. A new German Peace Society with forty-six members has been formed at Giengen, Würtemberg, through the influence of Mr. Otto Umfrid and Mr. Hartmann of Stuttgart.

The Norwegian Storting has selected as members of the Committee to award the prizes under the will of Alfred Nobel, Ex-Prime Minister Steen, the poet Björnsterne Björnson, Mr. Getz, Esq., and Representatives Lund and Lövland. By universal consent among the peace societies the peace prize for the first year we believe would be voted to the Baroness von Suttner who through her books and her personal influence has exercised an unsurpassed influence throughout Europe for peace and goodwill.

Since the above was written the announcement has been made that the Nobel prize for this year has been awarded to the Russian artist Vereschagin who by his pictures has done so much to render war loathsome in public estimation.

---

There ought to be no great difficulty in founding a large and influential Anglo-American Committee, such as is proposed by Mr. James Stokes in an article quoted on another page. A Franco-Italian and an Anglo-German Committee of similar character have already been formed for the promotion of better relations between those countries. Considering the extent of the territories of the United States and of Great Britain and the greatness of the mutual interests and obligations of the two countries, the Anglo-American Committee suggested by Mr. Stokes, if such should be formed, might very properly be given a somewhat wider scope and be made an Anglo-American Federation Society. There are many prominent people all over the United States who would be glad to connect themselves with such a Society at the expense of a small fee. The Society could easily be directed by small committees in Washington and London, and exert a most wholesome and extended influence in creating better mutual understanding and consequent better feeling between the two nations. The idea is very like that of Mr. Hodgson Pratt, president of the International Arbitration and Peace Association, who has for years been advocating the formation, in all the great capitals of the world, of Committees of International Conciliation. Our readers will be glad to look at Mr. Stokes' suggestion and some letters which he has received in reference to it. The time may not yet be ripe for the realization of the idea, but its careful consideration may lead to something practical.

---

According to the regulations of the British Foreign Office Sir Julian Pauncefote, who has been one of the best British Ambassadors ever sent to Washington, would retire from his present position next year. Lord Salisbury is reported to have extended his term of service for twelve months. This is an unusual honor, which the British Ambassador has well merited by his distinguished services during an exceptionally difficult period of Anglo-